



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

than as touches of portraiture. It is the portrait quality—a rare thing, to be sure!—that is absent from this admirable political monograph. And after all it is portraiture with regard to Toombs that we want. Outside the Georgia entanglement it is not yet proved that he is essential to the understanding of the political conflicts of 1845–1860. The opportunity before the biographer of Toombs is to make plain how it was that a politician as high-minded as Toombs was driven to regard those conflicts as he did. To-day, when such writers as Professor Dodd are seeking to revolutionize our view of the whole Confederate movement, when one set of conventional appreciations are passing and a new set are threatening to precipitate themselves, what we want above all is a convincing clew to the inner consciousness of the Southern leaders. Do the theories applied by Professor Dodd to Calhoun and Davis—the monopolistic theories, so to speak—find additional support in the life of Toombs, or, when that life is fully analyzed and translated into modern terms, do they begin to find in it their refutation? It is in answering such questions that the biographer of Toombs can serve his generation. Let us hope that Professor Phillips after so admirably clearing the ground intends eventually to attack the subtler problem.

N. W. STEPHENSON.

History of the United States of America under the Constitution.

By JAMES SCHOULER. Volume VII. *History of the Reconstruction Period, 1865–1877*. (New York: Dodd, Mead, and Company. 1913. Pp. xvi, 398.)

THIS book marks the completion of a task begun many years ago “without fear or favor”, the first result of which was a volume published in 1880. Twice since then—in 1891 when the fifth volume appeared, which brought the narrative to Lincoln’s inauguration, and again in 1899 with a sixth volume on the epoch of Civil War—the author believed that his contribution to United States history was finished. But the temptation aroused by the accessibility of the Johnson manuscripts in the Library of Congress, and especially by the publication of Gideon Welles’s *Diary* could not be resisted, for, as Mr. Schouler says, “borne onward by some invisible current”, he felt forced to aid in vindicating Johnson’s memory. So far as it is concerned with Johnson’s presidency, the present book is based upon articles by the author (hitherto printed) and upon lectures delivered by him at Johns Hopkins and Harvard universities. Familiar with the circumstances and incidents of President Grant’s two terms, Mr. Schouler was still further moved to draw on his personal recollections and, in particular, on Mr. Rhodes’s account of the period, for the sake of bringing the narrative to the opening of the Hayes administration. The whole book is a well-balanced story of twelve momentous years.

That portion of the book devoted to Johnson’s administration is distinctly the more carefully studied and matured. With sufficient regard

to other topics of political and social significance, the author has given chief attention to the story of the struggle for political advantage which culminated in the President's impeachment and trial for treason. Believing that Johnson understood quite as well as Lincoln that events by the spring of 1865 had tended to reconstruct the South, and that Johnson's policy of punishing only the leaders in the South, of clemency to the masses, and of restoring republican governments there was essentially sound, Mr. Schouler relates the unfortunate circumstances which brought this presidential policy to its doom. The narrative, scattering admiration of Johnson all along the line, is well suited to the author's design of formulating a new estimate of Andrew Johnson. With a wider comprehension of the general situation than Gideon Welles could possibly have had, the historian has reproduced essentially the figure that stands forth so clearly in Welles's *Diary*. The point of view makes large allowance for Johnson—too large, I think—and is so definitely in the nature of a plea as to fail to be satisfying. Questions keep rising: Is Johnson's record really "hard to comprehend", even though it presents various and contradictory aspects? Had he seen his way to favor the Fourteenth Amendment, would he yet have succeeded in reconciling his position with those of his antagonists in Congress led by such men as Thaddeus Stevens, Benjamin F. Butler, and Charles Sumner? That Johnson was a man of vigorous intelligence and uprightness of intent, there cannot be much doubt. But with his lack of judgment, with no adroitness, and with inflexible and uncritical veneration of the Constitution—failings which Mr. Schouler does not ignore—can he fairly be termed a "constructive" executive (p. 142)?

The remainder of the book is concerned with many details of Grant's administration—notably with its financial and foreign policy, with the outcome of reconstruction during the period, and finally with the disputed election of 1876. To such an extent has the author depended for his facts on Mr. Rhodes that he has given almost no attention to the constantly growing and comparatively recent monographic literature on the subject. True, he cites several of the articles in the "After the War" series which appeared in the *Century Magazine* (1912-1913). But he has completely ignored Professor Dunning's careful considerations on Southern conditions to be found in *Reconstruction, Political and Economic* (1907). It is not quite clear why Mr. Schouler should pass over the scandal of the Tweed Ring, a matter which aroused at the time widespread comment and brought Samuel J. Tilden into deserved and high repute. The author's estimate of Tilden, it should be said, is peculiarly discerning and distinctly higher than that of Rhodes. In two sections termed, respectively, the District of Columbia (pp. 179-193) and Centennial Celebrations (pp. 280-311), Mr. Schouler has brought into his narrative certain new considerations, enlivening the accounts in both sections by personal reminiscences.

The following errors of statement stand out: The House resolution of February 20, 1866, was a concurrent, not a joint, resolution (p. 53).

The phrase "indecent orgy" (p. 73) as applied to Johnson's "swinging around the circle" was Lowell's (*North American Review*, October, 1866, p. 125). The first of three decisions of the Supreme Court "during the summer of 1867" (p. 101) was handed down on December 17, 1866; the other two decisions came on January 14, 1867. Is it not straining the evidence to assert that Stanton "had mainly composed Johnson's veto message on the Tenure of Office act" (p. 110)? To write that Arthur as vice-president "bore himself with unexpected dignity, composure and discretion" (p. 210) is to overlook the general opinion that he compromised the character of his office by his speech at the Dorsey dinner, by his prevention of the election of a president *pro tem.* of the Senate, and by his lobbying at Albany on behalf of the election to the national Senate of his friend, ex-Senator Conkling. Misprints or minor inaccuracies in quotations will be found on pages 2, 66, 234, 246, 250, 253, 263, 289, 301, 302, and 343. The index to the seven volumes is poor.

HENRY BARRETT LEARNED.

The Granger Movement: a Study of Agricultural Organization and its Political, Economic, and Social Manifestations, 1870-1880.

By SOLON JUSTUS BUCK, Ph.D., Research Associate in History, University of Illinois. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1913. Pp. xi, 384.)

THE young social reformer will find this book wholesome reading. He will discover both the significance and the dangers of his programme. Its significance, in that the present forward-looking movement is firmly rooted in popular and justifiable agitations a generation old; its dangers, in the possibility of stirring masses of people into unwarranted expectations. The grievances of the farmers of the seventies sound strangely familiar to-day.

Therefore it is a real service that Dr. Buck has rendered in this well-written, fair-minded, and exhaustive study of a movement that is not only historically interesting, but as he himself indicates, was the precursor and in fact the formulating force of that period of American history, not yet closed, "in which the dominant feature has been a struggle of the people, or parts of them at different times, to preserve the political and economic democracy which they believe to be endangered, if not actually destroyed, by the rising power and influence of great accumulations and combinations of wealth".

Dr. Buck states the causes underlying this farmers' movement of the decade of 1870-1880, describes the organization of the Grange, around which gathered the forces of reform, and devotes a chapter each to the political, the co-operative, and the social and educational features of the movement. In three chapters there is an admirable analysis and summary of the attempt to control the railways, which was, in popular interest and perhaps in ultimate political importance, the dominant